United Nations A/HRC/27/40

General Assembly

Distr.: General
30 June 2014

Original: English

Human Rights Council
Twenty-third session
Agenda items 2 and 8
Annual report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights and reports of the Office of the High Commissioner and the Secretary-General

Follow-up and implementation of the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action

Activities of the International Coordinating Committee of National Human Rights Institutions for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights in accrediting national institutions in compliance with the Paris Principles

Report of the Secretary-General*

Summary

The present report is submitted pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 23/17 of 23 June 2013 and contains information on activities carried out from May 2013 to March 2014 by the Subcommittee on Accreditation of the International Coordinating Committee of National Institutions for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights in considering and reviewing applications for accreditation and reaccreditation of national human rights institutions.

* The annex to the present report is circulated as received, in the language of submission only.

GE.14-06883 (E)

1406883

Please recycle

Contents

		Paragraphs	*Pages*
I.	Introduction	1–4	3
II.	Improvement of the International Coordinating Committee accreditation process	5–12	3
III.	Accreditation process in 2013 and the first session of 2014	13–22	5
IV.	Conclusions and recommendations	23–31	7
Annex			
	Status of national institutions accredited by the International Coordinating Committee of National Institutions for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights		8

I. Introduction

1. The present report is submitted pursuant to paragraph 29 of Human Rights Council resolution 23/17, in which the Council requested the Secretary-General to report to the Human Rights Council at its twenty-seventh session on the activities of the International Coordinating Committee of National Human Rights Institutions for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights in accrediting national institutions in accordance with the principles relating to the status of national institutions for the promotion and protection of human rights (Paris Principles).

2. The report includes activities and achievements since the report issued in 2013 on the accreditation of national human rights institutions (A/HRC/23/28).

3. The statute of the International Coordinating Committee mandates the Subcommittee on Accreditation to review and analyse the applications for accreditation submitted by national human rights institutions and to make recommendations to the Bureau of the International Coordinating Committee on the compliance of applicants with the Paris Principles. The Subcommittee comprises one representative of an "A" status national human rights institution from each of the four regional groupings of the International Coordinating Committee: Africa, the Americas, Asia and the Pacific and Europe. The members of the Subcommittee are appointed by each regional grouping for a renewable term of three years. The members designate the Chair by consensus, from among themselves, for a renewable term of one year. In accordance with article 6 of the statute of the International Coordinating Committee, meetings of the Subcommittee on Accreditation shall be held under the auspices of, and in cooperation with, the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR).

4. During the period covered by the report, the Subcommittee members were from Canada, France, Mauritania and Qatar. The Chair of the Subcommittee was the chair of the national human rights institution of Qatar. In May 2013, a representative of the national human rights institution of Germany substituted for a representative of the national human rights institution of France, since the latter institution was under consideration for reaccreditation during the Subcommittee session.

II. Improvement of the International Coordinating Committee accreditation process

5. The International Coordinating Committee has introduced various measures to improve its accreditation procedures:

(a) The review of national human rights institutions, which is aimed at assessing their effectiveness and performance, has become more rigorous, as it is based on documented evidence provided by the institution under review, as well as on information received from civil society organizations and other stakeholders. The review has also become fairer, since an appeals procedure was included to give institutions an opportunity to challenge the recommendations issued by the Subcommittee on Accreditation;

(b) The Subcommittee on Accreditation issues a number of focused and tailored recommendations to the national human rights institution under review, even when it recommends an "A" status;

(c) Recommendations by the Subcommittee on Accreditation, once adopted by the Committee Bureau, are made public in the report of the Subcommittee, which is posted on the International Coordinating Committee website (nhri.ohchr.org).

6. Where, in accordance with article 16.2 of the statute of the International Coordinating Committee, it appears that the circumstances of any national human rights institution accredited with an "A" status may have changed in a way which affects its compliance with the Paris Principles, the Chair of the Committee or the Subcommittee on Accreditation may initiate a special review of the accreditation of that institution. Further to special review, the status of national human rights institution can be either maintained or downgraded.

7. With regard to flagrant cases, where the independence and credibility of "A" status national human rights institutions come under threat due to exceptional circumstances, and pending the conclusion of the special review process, article 18.2 of the statute of the International Coordinating Committee stipulates that where, in the opinion of the Chair of the International Coordinating Committee, an exceptional circumstance exists necessitating the urgent consideration of immediate suspension of an accredited "A" status institution, the [Committee] Bureau may decide to immediately suspend accreditation classification of that institution and initiate a special review, pursuant to article 16.2. Article 18.3 describes the procedure to be followed for the immediate suspension of accreditation in exceptional circumstances. As stipulated in article 18.4:

> for the purposes of article 18.2 and 18.3, an "exceptional circumstance" refers to a sudden and drastic change in the internal political order of a State such as: a break in the constitutional or democratic order; or a declared state of emergency; or gross violations of human rights; and is accompanied by any of the following: there is a change in the [national human rights institution] enabling legislation or other applicable law that is contrary to the Paris Principles; or there is [a] change in the composition of the [national human rights institution] that is not undertaken in accordance with the established selection and/or appointment process; or the [national human rights institution] acts in a way that seriously compromises its compliance with the Paris Principles.

8. In accordance with the accreditation procedure stipulated in article 12 of the statute of the International Coordinating Committee, the recommendations of the Subcommittee on Accreditation are submitted to the Committee Bureau for it to make the final decision on the accreditation status of the national human rights institutions reviewed, subsequent to the following process:

(a) The recommendation made by the Subcommittee on Accreditation is forwarded to the applicant;

(b) Within 28 days of receipt of the recommendation, the applicant may challenge it by submitting, through OHCHR, a written communication to the Chair of the International Coordinating Committee;

(c) The report of the Subcommittee, including the recommendation, is subsequently forwarded for decision to the Committee Bureau. If any challenges have been received from the national human rights institution reviewed, the challenges, together with the statements of compliance and the summaries prepared by OHCHR of all the documents submitted by the institutions concerned, are sent to the Bureau members to enable them to assess the validity of the challenges;

(d) If within 20 days of receipt of the report and the challenges at least four members of the Committee Bureau from no fewer than two regional groups notify the secretariat that they support the objection to the recommendation of the Subcommittee on Accreditation, the recommendation is referred to the Bureau at its next meeting for decision;

(e) If at least four members from two or more regional groups do not raise any objection to the recommendation within 20 days of its receipt, the recommendations will be deemed approved by the Committee Bureau;

(f) The accreditation decision of the Bureau of the International Coordinating Committee is final.

9. In accordance with the rules of procedure of the Subcommittee on Accreditation, the classifications for accreditation are:

- "A" status: Compliant with the Paris Principles
- "B" status: Not fully compliant with the Paris Principles
- "C" status: Non-compliant with the Paris Principles

10. The Subcommittee on Accreditation also welcomes reports from civil society organizations on the functioning and efficiency of national human rights institutions under review. Such reports are shared with the institutions concerned for their comments or clarification. Summaries of all documentation received from institutions are prepared by the secretariat and shared with the relevant institutions prior to review. National human rights institutions are given one week to point out any factual errors in the summaries. The summaries and comments are subsequently brought to the attention of the members of the Subcommittee.

11. The following may attend meetings of the Subcommittee as observers: representatives of the secretariat of the Network of African national human rights institutions; the secretariat of the Asia Pacific Forum of national human rights institutions; the secretariat of the European Network of national human rights institutions; the Network of the Americas; and the representative of the International Coordinating Committee.

12. The Subcommittee on Accreditation acknowledges the dedicated professionalism demonstrated by OHCHR in assuming the secretariat function and successfully servicing two sessions per year.

III. Accreditation process in 2013 and the first session of 2014

13. The General Assembly, in its resolution 67/163, encouraged the Ombudsman, mediator and other national human rights institutions to request, in cooperation with OHCHR, their accreditation by the International Coordinating Committee in order to enable them to interact effectively with the relevant human rights bodies of the United Nations system.

14. By 23 May 2014, the number of accredited national human rights institutions had reached 106. Of these, 71 had "A" status, 25 "B" status and 10 "C" status (see annex).

15. During the three sessions under review, the Subcommittee on Accreditation issued recommendations emphasizing the need for a clear, transparent and participatory selection process of members of national human rights institutions, as required by the Paris Principles and by the Subcommittee in its general observations on the International Coordinating Committee. It also stressed the importance of the provision of adequate core funding by the State to ensure the independence and financial autonomy of such institutions. In addition, the Subcommittee recognized the importance of members of national institutions being granted immunity against legal liability for actions taken in their official capacity. It furthermore stressed the need for greater cooperation by and engagement of national human rights institutions with regional and international human rights systems.

16. In March 2014, the Subcommittee on Accreditation initiated the practice of deliberating in camera, without the presence of OHCHR, which serves as the secretariat of the Subcommittee meetings. In accordance with article 6 of the statute of the International Coordinating Committee, general meetings of the International Coordinating Committee and meetings of the Subcommittee on Accreditation shall be held under the auspices of, and in cooperation with, OHCHR. Accordingly, OHCHR ought to be present in decision-making meetings of the Sub-Committee.

New applications

17. During the two sessions of 2013 and the first session of 2014, the Subcommittee considered six new applications for accreditation. Further to the Subcommittee's deliberations, the Office for the Protection of Citizens of Haiti and the Netherlands Institute for Human Rights were accredited with "A" status. The Ethiopian Human Rights Commission, the Oman National Human Rights Commission and the National Centre for Human Rights of Slovakia were accredited with "B" status. The decision on accreditation for the Commissioner for Fundamental Rights of Hungary has been deferred to the second session of 2014, pending the receipt of clarification from the institution.

Applications for reaccreditation

18. The Subcommittee on Accreditation reviewed 22 national human rights institutions for reaccreditation, from Afghanistan, Albania, Armenia, Croatia, Egypt, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Guatemala, Malawi, Mongolia, Paraguay, the Republic of Korea, the Russian Federation, Rwanda, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Uganda, Ukraine and Venezuela.

19. The national human rights institutions of Armenia, Croatia, France, Georgia, Ghana, Guatemala, Rwanda, Timor-Leste, Togo, Uganda and Venezuela were reaccredited with "A" status.

Deferrals

20. The reaccreditation decisions for the national human rights institutions of Albania, Afghanistan, Egypt, Germany, Malawi, Mongolia, Paraguay, the Republic of Korea, the Russian Federation, Thailand and Ukraine have been deferred to future sessions of the Subcommittee on Accreditation, pending receipt of clarification from the institutions.

Special review

21. During the period under review and in accordance with articles 16.2, 17 and 18 of the statute, the Subcommittee on Accreditation conducted a special review of the national human rights institutions of Indonesia and Nepal. Further to its deliberations, the Subcommittee decided that the national human rights institution of Indonesia should retain its "A" status. The A special review of the national human rights institution of Nepal has been deferred to October 2014.

22. In March 2014, the Subcommittee on Accreditation decided to conduct a special review of the national human rights institution of Venezuela in October 2014.

IV. Conclusions and recommendations

23. **The Secretary-General commends the Subcommittee on Accreditation for its performance and underscores the dedicated and professional support provided by OHCHR to its work and in the accreditation process.**

24. **The Paris Principles and the general observations adopted by the International Coordinating Committee which interpret those principles, remain the basis on which the Subcommittee accredits national human rights institutions. In order to do so, in addition to legislation and other documentation submitted by institutions, the Subcommittee invites civil society organizations to provide input on the functioning of institutions under review.**

25. **With the enhanced role of "A" status national human rights institutions in the proceedings of the Human Rights Council, the Subcommittee on Accreditation is more vigilant and rigorous in granting "A" status, to ensure that only institutions fully compliant with the Paris Principles can make use of the benefits granted to "A" status national human rights institutions in their interaction with the Human Rights Council mechanisms, including the universal periodic review process.**

26. **The role of OHCHR in acting as secretariat for the Subcommittee and in the holding of the Subcommittee's meetings under its auspices, enhances the credibility of the accreditation process before the international and regional human rights systems. The presence of OHCHR during the decision-making process is instrumental to attesting the compliance of this process with the established rules of procedure, and contributes to its transparency, fairness and rigour.**

27. **National human rights institutions are urged to implement recommendations emanating from the Subcommittee on Accreditation with a view to enhancing their compliance with the Paris Principles and their effectiveness in discharging their mandate. Governments and other stakeholders, including United Nations entities, are encouraged to assist the national human rights institutions in implementing those recommendations**

28. **Newly established national human rights institutions are encouraged to request accreditation by the International Coordinating Committee in order to interact effectively with peer institutions as well as the regional and international human rights system.**

29. **The interdependence and indivisibility of human rights require that the broad mandate of national human rights institutions, as set out in the Paris Principles and emphasized by the Subcommittee, include the promotion and protection of all rights: civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights.**

30. **The Paris Principles require that the composition of national human rights institutions and the appointment of their members, by means of election or otherwise, ensure the pluralistic representation of social forces (civil society) involved in the protection and promotion of human rights. The Subcommittee on Accreditation interprets that provision as requiring a clear, transparent, merit-based and participatory selection and appointment process. It is recommended that the selection and appointment process, be formalized in the legislation establishing national human rights institutions and/or in binding administrative guidelines, as appropriate.**

31. **The Secretary-General encourages Member States and other stakeholders to guarantee through financial contribution the continuation of high-quality servicing of the Subcommittee on Accreditation by OHCHR.**

Annex

[English only]

Status of national institutions accredited by the International Coordinating Committee of National Institutions for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights

Accreditation status as of 23 May 2014

In accordance with the Paris Principles and the Statute of the International Coordinating Committee of National Institutions for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights, the following classifications for accreditation are used by the Committee:

A: Compliant with the Paris Principles;

B: Not fully compliant with the Paris Principles;

C: Non-compliant with the Paris Principles.

*A(R): The category of accreditation with reserve, previously granted where insufficient documentation had been submitted to allow for conferral of "A" status, is no longer in use by the International Coordinating Committee. It is used only for those national human rights institutions which were accredited with this status before April 2008.

Human Rights Council

"A" status institutions (71)

National institution	*Status*	*Year reviewed*
Asia and the Pacific		
Afghanistan: Independent Human Rights Commission	A	October 2007 – A* November 2008 November 2013 – deferred to October 2014
Australia: Australian Human Rights Commission	A	1999 October 2006 May 2011
India: National Human Rights Commission	A	1999 October 2006 May 2011 – A*
Indonesia: National Human Rights Commission (Komnas HAM)	A	2000 March 2007 March 2012* November 2013 – special review in March 2014 March 2014 – A*

National institution	*Status*	*Year reviewed*
Jordan:	A	April 2006 (B)
National Centre for Human Rights		March 2007 (B)
		October 2007 – A*
		October 2010 – A
Malaysia:	A	2002
Human Rights Commission (SUHAKAM)		April 2008 – recommended to be accredited B
		November 2009 – A*
		October 2010 – A
Mongolia:	A	2002 – A(R)
National Human Rights Commission		2003
		November 2008
		November 2013 – deferred to October 2014
Nepal:	A	2001 – A(R)
National Human Rights Commission		2002 – A
		October 2007 – A*
		November 2008 – A*
		March 2010 – recommended to be accredited B
		May 2011 – A
		November 2012 – special review in May 2013
		May 2013 – deferred to November 2013
		November 2013 – deferred to March 2014
		March 2014 – deferred to October 2014
New Zealand:	A	1999
Human Rights Commission		October 2006
		May 2011
State of Palestine:	A	2005 – A(R)
Independent Commission for Human Rights		March 2009 – A
Qatar:	A	October 2006 (B)
National Committee for Human Rights		March 2009 – A*
		March 2010 – A*
		October 2010 – A
Philippines:	A	1999
Philippines Commission on Human Rights		March 2007 – deferred to October 2007
		October 2007
		March 2012
Republic of Korea:	A	2004
National Human Rights Commission		November 2008
		March 2014 – deferred to October 2014
Thailand:	A	2004
National Human Rights Commission		November 2008
		November 2013 – deferred to March 2014
		March 2014 – deferred to October 2014

National institution	*Status*	*Year reviewed*
Timor-Leste: Provedoria for Human Rights and Justice	A	April 2008 November 2013
Africa		
Burundi: Commission nationale indépendante des droits de l'homme	A	November 2012
Cameroon: National Commission on Human Rights and Freedoms	A	1999 October 2006 – (B) March 2010 – A
Egypt: National Council for Human Rights	A	April 2006 (B) October 2006 – A October 2011 – deferred to November 2012 November 2012 – deferred to May 2013 May 2013 – deferred to November 2013 November 2013 - deferred
Ghana: Commission on Human Rights and Administrative Justice	A	2001 November 2008 March 2014
Kenya: National Commission on Human Rights	A	2005 November 2008
Malawi: Human Rights Commission	A	2000 March 2007 March 2012 – deferred to November 2012 November 2012 – deferred to May 2013 May 2013- deferred to November 2013 November 2013 – deferred to October 2014
Mauritania: Commission nationale des droits de l'homme	A	November 2009 (B) May 2011 – A
Mauritius: Commission nationale des droits de l'homme	A	2002 April 2008 – A*
Morocco: Conseil nationale des droits de l'homme	A	1999 – A(R) 2001 October 2007 – A* October 2010 – A*
Namibia: Office of the Ombudsman	A	2003 – A(R) April 2006 May 2011
Nigeria: National Human Rights Commission	A	1999 – A(R) 2000 – A October 2006 – A October 2007 – B May 2011 – A

National institution	*Status*	*Year reviewed*
Rwanda: National Commission for Human Rights	A	2001 October 2007 March 2012 – recommended to be accredited B; given one year to establish compliance with Paris Principles May 2013 – A
Sierra Leone: Human Rights Commission	A	May 2011
South Africa: Human Rights Commission	A	1999 – A(R) 2000 October 2007 November 2012
Togo: Commission nationale des droits de l'homme	A	1999 – A(R) 2000 October 2007 November 2012 – deferred to May 2013 May 2013 – A
Uganda: Human Rights Commission	A	2000 – A(R) 2001 April 2008 May 2013 – A
United Republic of Tanzania: Commission for Human Rights and Good Governance	A	2003 – A(R) October 2006 – A October 2011 – A*
Zambia: Human Rights Commission	A	2003 – A(R) October 2006 October 2011
Americas		
Argentina: Defensoría del Pueblo de la Nación Argentina	A	1999 October 2006 October 2011
Bolivia (Plurinational State of): Defensor del Pueblo	A	1999 (B) 2000 – A March 2007 March 2012
Canada: Canadian Human Rights Commission	A	1999 October 2006 May 2011
Chile: Instituto Nacional de Derechos Humanos	A	November 2012
Colombia: Defensoría del Pueblo	A	2001 October 2007 March 2012 – A*

National institution	*Status*	*Year reviewed*
Costa Rica:	A	1999
Defensoría de los Habitantes		October 2006
		October 2011
Ecuador:	A	1999 – A(R)
Defensor del Pueblo		2002
		April 2008 – A; recommended to be accredited B; given one year to establish compliance with Paris Principles
		March 2009 – A
El Salvador:	A	April 2006
Procuraduría para la Defensa de los Derechos Humanos		May 2011
Guatemala:	A	1999 (B)
Procuraduría de los Derechos Humanos		2000 – A(R)
		2002
		April 2008
		May 2013 - A
Haiti:	A	November 2013
Office for the Protection of Citizens		
Mexico:	A	1999
Comisión Nacional de los Derechos Humanos		October 2006
		October 2011
Nicaragua:	A	April 2006
Procuraduría para la Defensa de los Derechos Humanos		May 2011
Panama:	A	1999
Defensoría del Pueblo		October 2006
		November 2012
Paraguay:	A	2003
Defensoría del Pueblo		November 2008
		November 2013 – deferred to March 2014
		March 2014 – deferred to October 2014
Peru:	A	1999
Defensoría del Pueblo		March 2007
		March 2012
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of):	A	2002
Defensoría del Pueblo		April 2008
		May 2013
		March 2014 – special review in October 2014
Europe		
Albania:	A	2003 – A(R)
People's Advocate		2004
		November 2008
		November 2013 – deferred to October 2014

National institution	*Status*	*Year reviewed*
Armenia:	A	April 2006 – A(R)
Human Rights Defender of Armenia		October 2006 – A
		October 2011 – deferred to November 2012
		November 2012 – deferred to May 2013
		May 2013 – A
Azerbaijan:	A	October 2006
Human Rights Commissioner (Ombudsman)		October 2010 – deferred to May 2011
		May 2011 – recommended to be accredited B; given one year to establish compliance with Paris Principles
		March 2012 – A
Bosnia and Herzegovina:	A	2001 – A(R)
Institution of Human Rights Ombudsmen		2002 – A(R)
		2003 – A(R)
		November 2009 – recommended to be accredited B; given one year to establish compliance with Paris Principles
		October 2010 – A
Croatia:	A	April 2008
Ombudsman		May 2013
Denmark:	A	1999 (B)
Danish Institute for Human Rights		2001
		October 2007 – A
		November 2012
France:	A	1999
Commission nationale consultative des droits de l'homme		October 2007
		November 2012 – deferred to May 2013
		May 2013 - A
Georgia:	A	October 2007
Public Defender's Office		November 2012 – deferred to May 2013
		May 2013 - A
Germany:	A	2001 – A(R)
Deutsches Institut für Menschenrechte		2002 – A(R)
		2003
		November 2008
		November 2013 – deferred to October 2014
Great Britain (United Kingdom):	A	November 2008 – A
Equality and Human Rights Commission		October 2010, special review – A
Greece:	A	2000 – A(R)
National Commission for Human Rights		2001
		October 2007 – A*
		November 2009 – A*
		March 2010 – A*

National institution	*Status*	*Year reviewed*
Ireland: Irish Human Rights Commission	A	2002 – A(R) 2003 – A(R) 2004 November 2008
Luxembourg: Commission consultative des droits de l'homme du Grand-Duché de Luxembourg	A	2001 – A(R) 2002 March 2009 – A* November 2009 – A* October 2010 – A
Netherlands: Netherlands Institute for Human Rights	A	March 2014
Northern Ireland (United Kingdom): Northern Ireland Human Rights Commission	A	2001 (B) May 2011
Poland: Human Rights Defender	A	1999 October 2007 November 2012
Portugal: Provedor de Justiça	A	1999 October 2007 November 2012
Russian Federation: Commissioner for Human Rights in the Russian Federation	A	2000 (B) 2001 (B) November 2008 – A November 2013 – deferred to October 2014
Scotland (United Kingdom): Scottish Human Rights Commission	A	November 2009 – deferred to March 2010 March 2010 – A
Serbia: Protector of Citizens	A	March 2010
Spain: El Defensor del Pueblo	A	2000 October 2007 November 2012
Ukraine: Ukrainian Parliament Commissioner for Human Rights	A	April 2008 (B) March 2009 – A March 2014 – deferred to October 2014

"B" status institutions (25)

National institution	*Status*	*Year reviewed*
Americas		
Honduras: Comisionado Nacional de los Derechos Humanos	B	2000 October 2007 (A) October 2010 – special review; recommended to be accredited B; given one year to establish compliance with Paris Principles October 2011 – B
Asia and the Pacific		
Bangladesh: National Human Rights Commission	B	May 2011
Maldives: Human Rights Commission	B	April 2008 March 2010
Oman: National Human Rights Commission	B	November 2013
Sri Lanka: Human Rights Commission	B	2000 October 2007 March 2009
Central Asia		
Kazakhstan: The Commissioner for Human Rights	B	March 2012
Kyrgyzstan: The Ombudsman	B	March 2012
Tajikistan: The Human Rights Ombudsman	B	March 2012
Africa		
Algeria: Commission Nationale de Promotion et de Protection des Droits de l'Homme	B	2000 – A(R) 2002 – A(R) 2003 – A March 2009 – B March 2010 – deferred to October 2010 October 2010 – B
Chad: Commission nationale des droits de l'homme	B	2000 – A(R) 2001 – A(R) 2003 – A(R) November 2009 – B
Congo: Commission nationale des droits de l'homme	B	October 2010
Mali: Commission nationale des droits de l'homme	B	March 2012

National institution	*Status*	*Year reviewed*
Senegal: Comité Sénégalais des Droits de l'Homme	B	2000 October 2007 – A* October 2010 – deferred to May 2011 May 2011 – deferred to October 2011 October 2011 – recommended to be accredited B; given one year to establish compliance with Paris Principles November 2012 – B
Tunisia: Comité supérieur des droits de l'homme et des libertés fondamentales	B	November 2009
Ethiopia: Ethiopian Human Rights Commission	B	November 2013
Europe		
Austria: The Austrian Ombudsman Board	B	2000 May 2011
Belgium: The Centre for Equal Opportunities and Opposition to Racism	B	1999 March 2010
Bulgaria: Commission for Protection Against Discrimination	B	October 2011
Bulgaria: The Ombudsman	B	October 2011
Norway: Norwegian Centre for Human Rights	B	2003 A(R) 2004 A(R) 2005 A(R) April 2006 May 2011 – deferred to October 2011 October 2011 – recommended to be accredited B; given one year to establish compliance with Paris Principles November 2012 – B
Republic of Moldova: The Centre for Human Rights	B	November 2009
Slovakia: Slovak National Centre for Human Rights	B	2002 – C October 2007 March 2012 – Accreditation lapsed due to non-submission of documentation March 2014 – B
Slovenia: Human Rights Ombudsman	B	2000 March 2010
Sweden: Equality Ombudsman	B	May 2011

National institution	*Status*	*Year reviewed*
The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia: The Ombudsman of the Republic of Macedonia	B	October 2011

"C" status institutions (10)

National institution	*Status*	*Year reviewed*
Africa		
Benin: Commission béninoise des droits de l'homme	C	2002
Madagascar: Commission nationale des droits de l'homme	C	2000 – A(R) 2002 – A(R) 2003 – A(R) April 2006 – status withdrawn October 2006 – C
Americas		
Antigua and Barbuda: Office of the Ombudsman	C	2001
Barbados: Office of the Ombudsman	C	2001
Puerto Rico (United States of America): Oficina del Procurador del Ciudadano del Estado Libre Asociado de Puerto Rico	C	March 2007
Asia and the Pacific		
Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of China: Equal Opportunities Commission	C	2000
Iran (Islamic Republic of): Islamic Human Rights Commission	C	2000
Europe		
Romania: Romanian Institute for Human Rights	C	March 2007 May 2011
Switzerland: Federal Commission for Women's Issues	C	March 2009
Switzerland: Federal Commission against Racism	C	1998 (B) March 2010 – C

Suspended institutions

National institution	*Status*	*Year reviewed*
Asia and the Pacific		
Fiji: Human Rights Commission	Suspended Note: Commission resigned from the International Coordinating Commission on 2 April 2007	2000 (A) March 2007 – accreditation suspended; documents to be submitted at October 2007 session 2 April 2007 – Commission resigned from the International Coordinating Commission
Africa		
Niger: Commission Nationale des Droits de l'Homme et des Libertés Fondamentales	Removed Note: dissolved in February 2010	March 2010 – removed further to its dissolution in February 2010

Institutions whose accreditation has lapsed

National institution	*Status*	*Year reviewed*
Africa		
Burkina Faso: Commission nationale des droits humains	B	2002 – A(R) 2003 – A(R) 2005 – B March 2012 – Accreditation lapsed due to non-submission of documentation
Europe		
Hungary: Parliamentary Commissioner for Civil Rights	B	May 2011 The institution ceased to exist further to the establishment of a new institution – Commissioner for Fundamental Rights
Netherlands: Equal Treatment Commission	B	1999 2004 March 2010 The institution ceased to exist further to the establishment of a new institution – The Netherlands Institute for Human Rights

Institution whose application has been deferred

National institution	*Status*	*Year reviewed*
Europe		
Hungary: Commissioner for Fundamental Rights		November 2013 – deferred to October 2014